arXiv:1302.3921v1 [cs.IT] 16 Feb 2013

Support detection in super-resolution

Carlos Fernandez-Granda
Department of Electrical Engineering, Stanford University
Stanford, CA, USA
Email: cfgranda@stanford.edu

***Abstract*—We study the problem of super-resolving a superposition of point sources from noisy low-pass data with a cut-off frequency f_c. Solving a tractable convex program is shown to locate the elements of the support with high precision as long as they are separated by $2/f_c$ and the noise level is small with respect to the amplitude of the signal.**

I. Introduction

The problem of super-resolution is of great importance in applications where the measuring process imposes a physical limit on the resolution of the available measurements. It is often the case that the signal of interest is well modeled as a superposition of point sources. Motivated by this, we consider a signal of the form

$$x = \sum_j a_j \delta_{t_j}, \tag{I.1}$$

consisting of a train of Dirac measures with complex amplitudes a_j located at different locations $\{t_j\}$ in the unit interval. Our aim is to estimate x from the lower end of its spectrum in the form of $n = 2f_c + 1$ Fourier series coefficients (f_c is an integer) perturbed by noise,

$$\begin{aligned} y(k) &= \int_0^1 e^{-i2\pi kt} x(\mathrm{d}t) + z(k) \\ &= \sum_j a_j e^{-i2\pi k t_j} + z(k), \end{aligned} \tag{I.2}$$

for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $|k| \leq f_c$. To ease notation, we write (I.2) as $y = \mathcal{F}_n\, x + z$. We model the perturbation $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ as having bounded ℓ_2 norm,

$$||z||_2 \leq \delta. \tag{I.3}$$

The noise is otherwise arbitrary and can be adversarial.

Even if we assume the signal x to be very sparse, without further conditions to ensure that the support of x is not too clustered the super-resolution problem is hopelessly ill-posed. This can be checked numerically, but also formalized thanks to the the seminal work of Slepian [4] on discrete prolate spheroidal sequences (see Section 3.2 of [3]). To avoid such extreme ill-posedness, we impose a lower bound on the minimum separation between the elements of the support of the signal.

Definition 1.1 (Minimum separation): Let $\mathbb{T}$ be the circle obtained by identifying the endpoints on $[0,1]$. For a family of points $T \subset \mathbb{T}$, the minimum separation is defined as the closest distance between any two elements from T,

$$\Delta(T) = \inf_{(t,t') \in T \,:\, t \neq t'} |t - t'|. \tag{I.4}$$

To recover x we propose minimizing the total variation of the estimate, a continuous analog to the ℓ_1 norm for discrete signals (see Appendix A in [3] for a rigorous definition), subject to data constraints:

$$\min_{\tilde{x}} ||\tilde{x}||_{\mathrm{TV}} \quad \text{subject to} \quad ||\mathcal{F}_n \tilde{x} - y||_2 \leq \delta, \tag{I.5}$$

where the minimization is carried out over the set of all finite complex measures $\tilde{x}$ supported on $[0,1]$. For details on how to solve (I.5) using semidefinite programming see [2], [3].

Previous work established that if

$$\Delta(T) \geq \frac{2}{f_c} := 2\lambda_c \tag{I.6}$$

TV-norm minimization achieves exact recovery in a noiseless setting [3]. Additionally, [2] characterized the reconstruction error for noisy measurements as the target resolution increases. In this work we study support detection using this method. If the original signal contains a spike of a certain amplitude we could ask: *How accurately can we recover the position of the spike? How does the accuracy depend on the noise level, the amplitude of the spike and the amplitude of the signal at other locations?* Our main result quantifies the local stability of the algorithm in order to answer such questions.

Theorem 1.2: Consider the noise model (I.3) *and assume the support T satisfies the minimum-separation condition* (I.6)*. The solution to problem* (I.5)[1]

$$\hat{x} = \sum_{\hat{t}_k \in \hat{T}} \hat{a}_k \delta_{\hat{t}_k}$$

---

[1] This solution can be shown to be an atomic measure with discrete support under very general conditions.

with support $\hat{T}$ obeys the properties

(i): $$\left|a_j - \sum_{\left\{\hat{t}_l \in \hat{T}:\, \left|\hat{t}_l - t_j\right| \le c\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}\right\}} \hat{a}_l\right| \le C_2\delta \quad \forall t_j \in T,$$

(ii): $$\sum_{\left\{\hat{t}_l \in \hat{T}:\, \left|\hat{t}_l - t_j\right| \le c\lambda_{\mathrm{c}},\, t_j \in T\right\}} \left|\hat{a}_l\right| \min_{t_i \in T} \left(t_l - t_i\right)^2 \le C_3 \lambda_{\mathrm{c}}^2 \delta,$$

(iii): $$\sum_{\left\{\hat{t}_l \in \hat{T}:\, \left|\hat{t}_l - t_j\right| > c\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}\, \forall t_j \in T\right\}} \left|\hat{a}_l\right| \le C_1\delta,$$

where C_1, C_2 and C_3 are positive numerical constants and $c = 0.1649$.

Properties (i) and (ii) show that the estimate clusters tightly around each element of the signal, whereas (iii) ensures that any spurious spikes detected by the algorithm have small amplitude. These bounds are essentially optimal for the case of adversarial noise, which can be highly concentrated. The main novelty of the result is that it provides local stability guarantees that only depend on the value of the signal at a given location. This allows to quantify the accuracy of support detection for each individual spike in the signal.

Corollary 1.3: Under the conditions of Theorem 1.2, for any element t_i in the support of x such that $a_i > C_2\delta$ there exists an element $\hat{t}_i$ in the support of the estimate $\hat{x}$ satisfying

$$\left|t_i - \hat{t}_i\right| \le \sqrt{\frac{C_3\delta}{|a_i| - C_2\delta}}\lambda_c.$$

Despite the aliasing effect of the low-pass filter applied to the signal, the bound on the support-detection error only depends on the amplitude of the corresponding spike (and the noise level). In contrast, the local bounds in [2] are not completely decoupled from the value of the signal at other locations, which makes it challenging to derive similar guarantees. A recent paper bounds the support-detection error of a related convex program in the presence of stochastic noise, but the bound depends on the amplitude of the solution rather than on the amplitude of the original spike [1].

II. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

We begin with an intermediate result proved in Section II-A.

Lemma 2.1: Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2

$$\sum_{\hat{t}_k \in \hat{T}} \left|\hat{a}_k\right| \min\left\{C_a, \frac{C_b\, d\left(\hat{t}_k, T\right)}{\lambda_c^2}\right\} \le 2\delta,$$

where C_a and C_b are positive numerical constants and

$$d\left(t, T\right) := \min_{t_i \in T} \left(t - t_i\right)^2.$$

Properties (ii) and (iii) are direct corollaries of Lemma (2.1). To establish property (i) we need an auxiliary lemma, proved in Section II-B.

Lemma 2.2: Suppose T obeys condition (I.6) *and $f_c \ge 10$. Then for any $t_j \in T$ there exists a low-pass polynomial $q_{t_j}(t) = \sum_{k=-f_c}^{f_c} b_k e^{i2\pi kt}$ such that*

$$q_{t_j}(t_j) = 1, \qquad \left|q_{t_j}(t)\right| < 1,$$

$$\left|1 - q_{t_j}(t)\right| \le \frac{C_1'\left(t - t_j\right)^2}{\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}^2}, \qquad \left|t - t_j\right| \le c\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}, \tag{II.1}$$

$$\left|q_{t_j}(t)\right| \le \frac{C_1'\left(t - t_l\right)^2}{\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}^2}, \qquad \left|t - t_l\right| \le c\lambda_{\mathrm{c}},\, t_l \in T / \left\{t_j\right\}, \tag{II.2}$$

$$\left|q_{t_j}(t)\right| < C_2', \qquad \left|t - t_j\right| > c\lambda_{\mathrm{c}},\, t_j \in T, \tag{II.3}$$

where $0 < c^2 C_2' \le C_1' < 1$.

Lemma 2.2 provides a low-frequency polynomial q_{t_j} such that $\int_{\mathbb{T}} q_{t_j}(t)x(\mathrm{d}t) = a_j$. By Parseval's Theorem and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{\mathbb{T}} q_{t_j}(t)x(\mathrm{d}t) - \int_{\mathbb{T}} q_{t_j}(t)\hat{x}(\mathrm{d}t)\right| &= \left|\sum_{k=-f_c}^{f_c} b_k \mathcal{F}_n(x - \hat{x})_k\right| \\ &\le \left|\left|q_{t_j}\right|\right|_2 \left|\left|\mathcal{F}_n(x - \hat{x})\right|\right|_2 \le 2\delta. \end{aligned} \tag{II.4}$$

By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.1

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\sum_{\left\{k:\, \left|\hat{t}_k - t_j\right| > c\lambda_c\right\}} \hat{a}_k q_{t_j}(\hat{t}_k) + \sum_{\left\{k:\, \left|\hat{t}_k - t_j\right| \le c\lambda_c\right\}} \hat{a}_k \left(q_{t_j}(\hat{t}_k) - 1\right)\right| \\ &\le \sum_{\left\{k:\, \left|\hat{t}_k - t_j\right| > c\lambda_c\right\}} \left|\hat{a}_k\right| \left|q_{t_j}(\hat{t}_k)\right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{\left\{k:\, \left|\hat{t}_k - t_j\right| \le c\lambda_c\right\}} \left|\hat{a}_k\right| \left|1 - q_{t_j}(\hat{t}_k)\right| \\ &\le \sum_{\hat{t}_k \in \hat{T}} \left|\hat{a}_k\right| \min\left\{C_2', \frac{C_1' d\left(\hat{t}_k, T\right)}{\lambda_c^2}\right\} \le C\delta, \end{aligned} \tag{II.5}$$

for a positive numerical constant C. Finally, combining Lemma 2.2, the triangle inequality, (II.4) and (II.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|a_j - \sum_{\left\{k:\, \left|\hat{t}_k - t_j\right| \le c\lambda_c\right\}} \hat{a}_k\right| \\ &= \left|\int_{\mathbb{T}} q_{t_j}(t)x(\mathrm{d}t) - \int_{\mathbb{T}} q_{t_j}(t)\hat{x}(\mathrm{d}t)\right. \\ &\quad + \sum_{\left\{k:\, \left|\hat{t}_k - t_j\right| > c\lambda_c\right\}} \hat{a}_k q_{t_j}(\hat{t}_k) \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\left\{k:\, \left|\hat{t}_k - t_j\right| \le c\lambda_c\right\}} \hat{a}_k \left(q_{t_j}(\hat{t}_k) - 1\right)\right| \\ &\le C'\delta, \end{aligned}$$

for a positive numerical constant C'.

A. *Proof of Lemma 2.1*

The proof relies on a low-pass polynomial provided by Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.5 in [3].

Lemma 2.3: Suppose T obeys (I.6) *and take any $v \in \mathbb{C}^{|T|}$ such that each entry v_j has unit magnitude. Then there exists a low-pass polynomial $q(t) = \sum_{k=-f_c}^{f_c} d_k e^{i2\pi kt}$ such that:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&q(t_j) = v_j, \qquad t_j \in T,\\
&|q(t)| < 1 - C_a, \qquad |t - t_j| > c\lambda_{\mathrm{c}} \quad \forall t_j \in T,\\
&|q(t)| \leq 1 - \frac{C_b\,(t-t_j)^2}{\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}^2}, \qquad |t - t_j| \leq c\lambda_{\mathrm{c}},\ t_j \in T,
\end{aligned}$$

with $0 < c^2 C_b \leq C_a < 1$.

We set $v_j = \overline{a_j}/|a_j|$. The lemma implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{T}} q(t)\hat{x}\,(\mathrm{d}t) &\leq \sum_k |\hat{a}_k|\,|q(\hat{t}_k)|\\
&\leq \sum_k \left(1 - \min\left\{C_a, \frac{C_b\, d\left(\hat{t}_k, T\right)}{\lambda_c^2}\right\}\right)|\hat{a}_k|\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{II.6}$$

The same argument used to prove (II.4) yields

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{T}} q(t)\hat{x}(\mathrm{d}t) - \int_{\mathbb{T}} q(t)x(\mathrm{d}t)\right| \leq 2\delta.$$

Now, taking into account that $\int_{\mathbb{T}} q(t)x\,(\mathrm{d}t) = ||x||_{\mathrm{TV}}$ by construction and $||\hat{x}||_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq ||x||_{\mathrm{TV}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{T}} q(t)\hat{x}\,(\mathrm{d}t) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} q(t)x\,(\mathrm{d}t)\\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}} q(t)\hat{x}(\mathrm{d}t) - \int_{\mathbb{T}} q(t)x(\mathrm{d}t)\\
&\geq ||x||_{\mathrm{TV}} - 2\delta\\
&\geq ||\hat{x}||_{\mathrm{TV}} - 2\delta = \sum_k |\hat{a}_k| - 2\delta.
\end{aligned} \tag{II.7}$$

Combining (II.6) and (II.7) completes the proof.

B. *Proof of Lemma 2.2*

The proof of Lemma 2.2 is similar to that of Lemma 2.3 (see Section 2 of [3]), where a low-frequency kernel and its derivative are used to interpolate an arbitrary sign pattern on a support satisfying the minimum-distance condition. More precisely, we set

$$q_{t_j}(t) = \sum_{t_k \in T} \alpha_k K(t - t_k) + \beta_k K^{(1)}(t - t_k), \tag{II.8}$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}^{|T|}$ are coefficient vectors, K is

$$K(t) = \left[\frac{\sin\left(\left(\frac{f_c}{2}+1\right)\pi t\right)}{\left(\frac{f_c}{2}+1\right)\sin(\pi t)}\right]^4, \qquad t \in \mathbb{T}\setminus\{0\}, \tag{II.9}$$

and $K(0) = 1$; here, $K^{(\ell)}$ is the ℓth derivative of K. Note that K, $K^{(1)}$ and, consequently, q_{t_j} are trigonometric polynomials of the required degree.

In order to satisfy the required properties, we impose

$$\begin{aligned}
&q_{t_j}(t_j) = 1, \qquad q_{t_j}(t_j) = 0, \quad t_j \in T/\{t_j\},\\
&q'_{t_j}(t_k) = 0, \qquad t_k \in T.
\end{aligned}$$

These constraints can be expressed in matrix form. Let $e_{t_j} \in \mathbb{R}^{|T|}$ denote the one-sparse vector with one nonzero entry at the position corresponding to t_j. Then,

$$\begin{bmatrix} D_0 & D_1 \\ D_1 & D_2 \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\alpha\\ \beta\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} e_{t_j} \\ 0\end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&(D_0)_{lk} = K\,(t_l - t_k)\,, \quad (D_1)_{lk} = K^{(1)}\,(t_l - t_k)\,,\\
&(D_2)_{lk} = K^{(2)}\,(t_l - t_k)\,,
\end{aligned}$$

and l and k range from 1 to $|T|$. It is shown in Section 2.3.1 of [3] that under the minimum-separation condition this system is invertible, so that α and β are well defined and $q(t_j) = 1$. These vectors can be expressed as

$$\begin{bmatrix}\alpha\\ \beta\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ -D_2^{-1}D_1\end{bmatrix} S^{-1}e_{t_j}, \quad S := D_0 - D_1 D_2^{-1} D_1,$$

where S is the Schur complement. Let $\|M\|_\infty$ denote the usual infinity norm of a matrix M defined as $\|M\|_\infty = \max_{\|x\|_\infty = 1}\|Mx\|_\infty = \max_l \sum_k |M_{lk}|$. Borrowing some results from Section 2.3.1 in [3],

$$\begin{aligned}
||I - S||_\infty &\leq 8.747\,10^{-3},\\
\left|\left|S^{-1}\right|\right|_\infty &\leq 1 + 8.824\,10^{-3},\\
\left|\left|I - S^{-1}\right|\right|_\infty &\leq \left|\left|S^{-1}\right|\right|_\infty ||S - I||_\infty \leq 8.825\,10^{-3},\\
\left|\left|\alpha - e_{t_j}\right|\right|_\infty &\leq \left|\left|I - S^{-1}\right|\right|_\infty \left|\left|e_{t_j}\right|\right|_\infty\\
&\leq 8.825\,10^{-3},
\end{aligned} \tag{II.10}$$

$$||\beta||_\infty \leq 3.294\,10^{-2}\lambda_c. \tag{II.11}$$

Lemma 2.6 in [3] allows to obtain

$$K\,(t) \leq \frac{1}{(f_c t)^4} \leq 0.333, \quad K'\,(t) \leq \frac{4\pi}{f_c^3 t^4} \leq 4.18\,f_c,$$

for $|t| > c\lambda_c$ as long $f_c \geq 10$. By the same lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t_k \in T\setminus\{t_a, t_b\}} |K\,(t - t_k)|\\
&\leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\left(f_c\Delta_{\min}(1/2 + l)\right)^4} + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\left(f_c\Delta_{\min} l\right)^4} \leq 1.083,\\
&\sum_{t_k \in T\setminus\{t_a, t_b\}} \left|K^{(1)}\,(t - t_k)\right|\\
&\leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{4\pi}{f_c^3\left(\Delta_{\min}(1/2 + l)\right)^4} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{4\pi}{f_c^3\left(\Delta_{\min} l\right)^4} \leq 1.75\,f_c,
\end{aligned}$$

where t_a and t_b are the two spikes nearest to t. Let t_i be the element of $T/\{t_j\}$ that is nearest to t.

Combining these inequalities with (II.10) and (II.11) proves that

$$\begin{aligned}
|q_{t_j}(t)| &= \Big| \sum_{t_k \in T} \alpha_k K(t-t_k) + \sum_{t_k \in T} \beta_k K^{(1)}(t-t_k) \Big| \\
&\leq |K(t-t_j)| + \left|\left|\alpha - e_{t_j}\right|\right|_\infty \Big(|K(t-t_j)| \\
&\quad + |K(t-t_i)| + \sum_{t_k \in T \setminus \{t_i, t_j\}} |K(t-t_k)| \Big) \\
&\quad + ||\beta||_\infty \Big(\left|K^{(1)}(t-t_j)\right| + \left|K^{(1)}(t-t_i)\right| \\
&\quad + \sum_{t_k \in T \setminus \{t_i, t_j\}} \left|K^{(1)}(t-t_k)\right| \Big), \\
&\leq 0.69, \quad \text{if } |t-t_k| > c\lambda_c, \ t_k \in T,
\end{aligned}$$

so that (II.3) holds. The proof is completed by two lemmas which prove (II.1) and (II.2) and $|q_{t_j}(t)| < 1$ for any t. They rely on the following bounds borrowed from Section 2 of [3],

$$\begin{aligned}
K(t) &\geq 0.9539, & K^{(2)}(t) &\leq -2.923\, f_c^2, \\
\left|K^{(1)}(t)\right| &\leq 0.5595\, f_c, & \left|K^{(2)}(t)\right| &\leq 3.393\, f_c^2, \\
\left|K^{(3)}(t)\right| &\leq 5.697\, f_c^3,
\end{aligned} \tag{II.12}$$

and on the fact that, due to Lemma 2.7 in [3] it holds that for any $t_0 \in T$ and $t \in \mathbb{T}$ obeying $|t-t_0| \leq c\lambda_c$,

$$\sum_{t_k \in T \setminus \{t_0\}} \left|K^{(2)}(t-t_k)\right| \leq 1.06\, f_c^2 \tag{II.13}$$

$$\sum_{t_k \in T \setminus \{t_0\}} \left|K^{(3)}(t-t_k)\right| \leq 18.6\, f_c^3. \tag{II.14}$$

Lemma 2.4: For any t such that $|t-t_j| \leq c\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}$,

$$1 - \frac{4.07\,(t-t_j)^2}{\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}^2} \leq q_{t_j}(t) \leq 1 - \frac{2.30\,(t-t_j)^2}{\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}^2}.$$

Proof We assume without loss of generality that $t_j = 0$. By symmetry, it suffices to show the claim for $t \in (0, c\,\lambda_c]$. By (II.10), (II.11), (II.12), (II.13) and (II.14),

$$\begin{aligned}
q_0''(t) &= \sum_{t_k \in T} \alpha_k K^{(2)}(t-t_k) + \sum_{t_k \in T} \beta_k K^{(3)}(t-t_k) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \left|\left|\alpha - e_{t_j}\right|\right|_\infty\right) K^{(2)}(t) \\
&\quad + \left|\left|\alpha - e_{t_j}\right|\right|_\infty \sum_{t_k \in T \setminus \{0\}} \left|K^{(2)}(t-t_k)\right| \\
&\quad + ||\beta||_\infty \Big(\left|K^{(3)}(t)\right| + \sum_{t_k \in T \setminus \{0\}} \left|K^{(3)}(t-t_k)\right| \Big) \\
&\leq -2.30\, f_c^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar computations yield $|q_0''(t)| \leq 4.07\, f_c^2$. Since $q_0(0) = 1$ and $q_0'(0) = 0$, this implies $1 - 4.07\,(f_c t)^2 \leq q_0(t) \leq 1 - 2.30\,(f_c t)^2$. ■

Lemma 2.5: For any $t_l \in T/\{t_j\}$ and t obeying $|t-t_l| \leq c\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}$, we have

$$|q_{t_j}(t)| \leq \frac{16.64\,(t-t_l)^2}{\lambda_{\mathrm{c}}^2}.$$

Proof We assume without loss of generality that $t_l = 0$. By symmetry, it suffices to show the claim for $t \in (0, c\,\lambda_c]$. By (II.10), (II.11), (II.12), (II.13) and (II.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|q_0''(t)| &= \left| \sum_{t_k \in T} \alpha_k K^{(2)}(t-t_k) + \sum_{t_k \in T} \beta_k K^{(3)}(t-t_k) \right| \\
&\leq \left(1 + \left|\left|\alpha + e_{t_j}\right|\right|_\infty\right) \left|K^{(2)}(t-t_j)\right| \\
&\quad + \left|\left|\alpha - e_{t_j}\right|\right|_\infty \left(\left|K^{(2)}(t)\right| + \sum_{t_k \in T \setminus \{0\}} \left|K^{(2)}(t-t_k)\right| \right) \\
&\quad + ||\beta||_\infty \left(\left|K^{(3)}(t)\right| + \sum_{t_k \in T \setminus \{0\}} \left|K^{(3)}(t-t_k)\right| \right) \\
&\leq 16.64\, f_c^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have also used that in the interval of interest $\left|K^{(2)}(t-t_j)\right| \leq \frac{18\pi^2}{f_c^2(\Delta_{\min} - 0.16 f_c)^4} \leq 15.67\, f_c^2$ due to Lemma 2.6 in [3]. Since $q_0(0) = 0$ and $q_0'(0) = 0$ are equal to zero, this implies $|q_0(t)| \leq 16.64 (f_c t)^2$. ■

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by a Fundación Caja Madrid Fellowship. The author is grateful to Emmanuel Candès for useful comments regarding this manuscript and for his support.

REFERENCES

[1] J. M. Azais, Y. de Castro and F. Gamboa. Spike detection from innacurate samplings. Preprint.

[2] E. J. Candès and C. Fernandez-Granda. Super-resolution from noisy data. Preprint.

[3] E. J. Candès and C. Fernandez-Granda. Towards a mathematical theory of super-resolution. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, to appear.

[4] D. Slepian. Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis, and uncertainty. V - The discrete case. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 57:1371–1430, 1978.